

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY



0 0003 6522 357

Provincial Report

English 30 Grade 12 Diploma Examination

September 1984

Student Evaluation

LB
3054
C2
D723
1984: June
c.2

Alberta
EDUCATION

EDUC

DISTRIBUTION:

Superintendents of Schools
School Principals and Teachers
The Alberta Teachers' Association
Alberta School Trustee's Association
Alberta Education
General Public upon Request

Ex libris
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
CHAPTER 1: THE GRADE 12 DIPLOMA EXAMINATIONS PROGRAM	1
Introduction	1
General High School Diploma	1
Advanced High School Diploma	1
Awarding of Course Credits	1
Transitional Provisions	2
Award of Excellence	2
CHAPTER 2: EXAMINATION DESIGN, DEVELOPMENT, AND DESCRIPTION	3
Examination Design and Development	3
Examination Description	4
Part A: Written Response	4
Reporting Categories for Part A: Written Response	4
Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)	6
Reporting Categories for Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)	6
Cognitive Levels for Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)	6
CHAPTER 3: ADMINISTRATION OF THE EXAMINATION	9
CHAPTER 4: SCORING OF PART A: WRITTEN RESPONSE	11
Organization of Markers	11
Training	11
Marking	11
Reliability Reviews	12
Scale-by-Scale Assignment of Final Mark	13
Handling of Discrepant Papers	13
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS	15
Total Examination Results	15
Standard-Setting	16
Relationship Between School-Awarded Marks and Examination Marks	16
Results for Part A: Written Response	17
Minor Assignment I (Critical Response)	17
Minor Assignment II (Personal Response)	18
Major Assignment	19
Results for Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)	20
Discussion of Selected Questions	22
Summary of Observations	25
Total Examination	25
Part A: Written Response	25
Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)	25
APPENDIX A: ENGLISH 30 WRITTEN-RESPONSE SCORING GUIDES	27
APPENDIX B: ENGLISH 30 SCORING SHEET	31
APPENDIX C: INDIVIDUAL MARKER PERFORMANCE REPORT	33

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	English 30 Diploma Examination Blueprint Part A: Written Response	5
2	Distribution of Reading Passage Types	6
3	English 30 Diploma Examination Blueprint Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)	7
4	Total Examination Results	15
5	Percentage Distribution of A's, B's, C's, and F's	16
6	Percentage Distribution of Scores on Minor Assignment I (Critical Response)	17
7	Percentage Distribution of Scores on Minor Assignment II (Personal Response)	18 18
8	Percentage Distribution of Scores on Major Assignment	19
9	Results for Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice) (Raw Scores)	20
10	Question Response Frequencies	21

PREFACE

This report presents the provincial results of the English 30 Diploma Examination administered on June 14 (Part A) and June 25 (Part B), 1984. During this second administration, the English 30 Diploma Examination was written by 12 186 students. In addition to the examination results, this report provides information about the examination development process and the examination itself.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This administration of the English 30 Diploma Examination was successful due to the concerted effort of all involved. Success would have been impossible without substantial contributions from many people, particularly the administrators, teachers, and students, who extended their full co-operation.

The technical expertise and advice received from the Examination Review Committee regarding design, development, and reporting have been particularly valuable in the implementation of this diploma examination. This Committee has representation from:

The Alberta Teachers' Association
The Conference of Alberta School Superintendents
The Universities' Co-ordinating Council
The Public Colleges of Alberta
Alberta Education

The contribution made by this group is gratefully acknowledged.

Lloyd E. Symyrozum
Director
Student Evaluation

CHAPTER 1

THE GRADE 12 DIPLOMA EXAMINATIONS PROGRAM

Introduction

The Grade 12 Diploma Examinations Program, which is an integral part of the high school diploma requirements, is intended to develop and maintain excellence in educational standards through certification of academic achievement. The program consists of course-specific examinations that are based on the prescribed *Program of Studies for Senior High Schools* for the following Grade 12 courses: English 30, English 33, Social Studies 30, Mathematics 30, Biology 30, Chemistry 30, and Physics 30.

All Grade 12 students in Alberta are now required to write at least ONE diploma examination in order to receive a high school diploma.

Alberta Education issues two distinct high school diplomas: the General High School Diploma and the Advanced High School Diploma.

General High School Diploma

To earn a General High School Diploma, a student must obtain course credit in either English 30 or English 33, and obtain 100 credits distributed over courses as specified in the *Junior-Senior High School Handbook*. Some students who are working toward the general diploma may wish to obtain credits in other diploma examination courses (i.e., Social Studies 30, Mathematics 30, Biology 30, Chemistry 30, and Physics 30). To obtain credits in these courses, a student must also write the appropriate diploma examination regardless of which type of diploma he wishes to receive.

Advanced High School Diploma

The Advanced High School Diploma represents achievement in an academic program that includes language arts (English), social studies, mathematics, and science. To earn an Advanced High School Diploma, a student must satisfy the current course and credit requirements for a General High School Diploma and obtain course credit in English 30, Social Studies 30, Mathematics 30, and ONE of Biology 30, Chemistry 30, or Physics 30.

Awarding of Course Credits

To obtain credit in any Grade 12 (30-level) course, a student must earn a final mark of 50% or better. To obtain credit in a Grade 12 (30-level) diploma examination course, a student must write the appropriate diploma examination and attain a final blended mark of 50% or better. The "final blended mark" is made up of 50% of the mark awarded by the school and 50% of the diploma examination mark. For example, a student taking English 30

might have a mark of 45% from his school and a mark of 57% on the diploma examination. This student's final mark is the average of the two marks, or 51%. He has therefore earned credits in English 30 because his final mark is over 50%.

Transitional Provisions

Alberta Education recognizes all course credits earned prior to September 1, 1983, for the purpose of awarding the General High School Diploma.

Students who have completed partial requirements for the Advanced High School Diploma prior to September 1, 1983, and who are enrolled in Grade 12 courses, may apply any of the previously completed required diploma examination subjects toward a diploma provided that they have earned a final course mark of 50% or better in each subject.

Award of Excellence

When a candidate for an Advanced High School Diploma obtains a final average of 80% or higher on the four required diploma examination courses with not less than 65% in any one of these four required courses, he receives an Award of Excellence. This Award of Excellence is noted on the student's Advanced High School Diploma.

When a student writes two or three of the diploma examinations in the sciences (i.e., Biology 30, Chemistry 30, and Physics 30), the highest of these final course marks is used for diploma purposes and in the calculation of the average for the Award of Excellence.

CHAPTER 2

EXAMINATION DESIGN, DEVELOPMENT, AND DESCRIPTION

Examination Design and Development

There were four stages in the development of the English 30 Diploma Examination: preparation of curriculum and examination specifications; examination design and development; field-testing of questions; and selection of questions for the final examination.

The Curriculum Branch of Alberta Education prepared curriculum specifications that identify the major content areas, the specific objectives within each area, and the emphasis each is to receive in the classroom. The curriculum specifications were distributed to all school jurisdictions in the province in the publication *Diploma Examinations: Curriculum Specifications for English 30* (July 1983). The Student Evaluation Branch of Alberta Education selected, from the prepared curriculum specifications, a set of diploma examination specifications that formed the basis of evaluation given the limitations of a paper-and-pencil examination design. These diploma examination specifications constitute Section C of *Curriculum Specifications for English 30*.

The examination design, complete with blueprints, scoring guides, and sample questions, was distributed to all school jurisdictions in the province in the Student Evaluation Branch publication *Grade 12 Diploma Examinations Program: English 30* (SEB Bulletin Volume 3, Number 2, September 1983).

Under the supervision of the Student Evaluation Branch, examination questions were developed by English 30 teachers from all parts of the province, field-tested, and subsequently revised. Questions were designed to reflect the reading and writing objectives outlined in the diploma examination specifications.

The final examination was constructed from those questions that best reflected curricular intent and examination design. It was reviewed by a committee of classroom teachers who estimated difficulty levels for each question and suggested revisions. The target mean for the English 30 Diploma Examination was set at 65%. The final draft was approved by an Examination Review Committee consisting of representatives from several stakeholder groups (two Grade 12 English teachers representing The Alberta Teachers' Association; one member each from the Conference of Alberta School Superintendents, the Universities Co-ordinating Council, and the Council of Presidents, Public Colleges of Alberta) and representatives from the Curriculum Branch, the Student Evaluation Branch, and the Regional Offices of Education. The Examination Review Committee checked the draft for content validity, accuracy, and technical merit. Changes were made to the examination as recommended by the committee.

Examination Description

The English 30 Diploma Examination consisted of two parts: Part A: Written Response, worth 50% of the total diploma examination score, and Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice), also worth 50% of the total score.

Part A: Written Response

Part A consisted of three sections. Minor Assignment I (Critical Response) required the student to read a story and a poem (which served as stimuli for all three sections) and to identify the attitude of the narrator of the story toward another character and toward his own role in the situation. The Critical Response Assignment was worth 15% of the mark awarded for Part A, or 7.5% of the total mark for the English 30 Diploma Examination. Minor Assignment II (Personal Response) required the student to choose from the two readings a character with whom he could identify, to explain what that character's actions suggest about his beliefs, and to discuss why he found the character's beliefs acceptable. The Personal Response Assignment was worth 15% of the mark awarded for Part A, or 7.5% of the total mark for the examination. The Major Assignment required the student to choose, from the literature studied, two characters who are similar to any two of the characters from the readings on the exam, to compare the ways in which the two characters chosen from literature approach life, to examine the motivation that prompts the characters to approach life as they do, to describe the consequences of the choices each character makes, and to express an opinion about those choices. The Major Assignment was worth 70% of the mark awarded for Part A, or 35% of the total mark for the examination.

Students were allowed to use a dictionary and a thesaurus. In each section, space was provided for planning and drafting and for revised work. Students were allotted two and one-half hours to write Part A.

Reporting Categories for Part A: Written Response

To provide meaningful information about student writing, it is necessary to examine students' responses in terms of writing components or factors that can be used as reporting categories. Factors evaluated in the minor assignments were: Thought and Detail - the content present in the student's writing (i.e., the concepts, ideas, and literary interpretations presented and the specific details selected to support these ideas) and Writing Skills - the accuracy and effectiveness with which the student uses diction, sentence structure, and the conventions of writing (i.e., proper spelling, punctuation, and grammar).

The major assignment was assessed according to five reporting categories: Total Impression - a general impression of the quality of the composition; Thought and Detail - the content present in the student's writing (i.e., the ideas, details, literary interpretation, and the supporting details from literature); Organization - the coherent development of a unified theme or thesis through an appropriate method of organization; Matters of Choice - the style of writing used by the student, choices of words and syntactic structures used to give emphasis and effectiveness to writing; and Matters of Convention - the mechanics of writing and the conventions of writing (i.e., proper spelling, punctuation, and grammar). The design of Part A is given in Table 1, page 5.

Table 1
English 30 Diploma Examination Blueprint
Part A: Written Response

TEST SECTION	REPORTING CATEGORY (Scoring Guide)	CROSS-REFERENCE TO ENGLISH 30 STATEMENT OF CONTENT**	DESCRIPTION OF WRITING ASSIGNMENT(S)	PROPORTION OF TOTAL MARK	
				BY REPORTING CATEGORY	BY TEST SECTION
MINOR ASSIGNMENTS	THOUGHT AND DETAIL*	Concepts 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13	The two writing assignments are connected to the reading of literary selections. One assignment requires the student to respond to the selections in a personal context.	10%	15%
	WRITING SKILLS The student should be able to communicate clearly and effectively in writing.	Concepts 2, 3, 4, 5	The other assignment requires the student to understand, analyse, and evaluate techniques used in literature, and to synthesize his thoughts clearly and correctly in writing.	5%	
MAJOR ASSIGNMENT	TOTAL IMPRESSION The student should be able to create a coherent, unified composition that demonstrates maturity of expression and awareness of audience, purpose, and tone.	Concepts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13		5%	35%
	THOUGHT AND DETAIL* The student should be able to under- stand meanings presented in literature; respond critically to literary form, structure, and style; and interpret experiences and values presented through literature. The student should also be able to select details from his own literary experience that will support the ideas he presents in writing.	Concepts 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13	The writing assignment sets a specific writing task, but allows the student to choose a method of development and to select supporting details (examples, illustrations) from personal experience with literature that he has studied. The writing assignment is generated from literary selections and requires the student to understand literal and implied meanings and to synthesize his thoughts clearly and correctly in writing.	15%	
	ORGANIZATION The student should be able to develop a coherent, unified theme or thesis by choosing an appropriate method of organization.	Concepts 2, 3, 4, 5		5%	
	MATTERS OF CHOICE The student should be able to use words and syntactic structures in a deliberate and controlled manner.	Concept 3		5%	
	MATTERS OF CONVENTION The student should be able to communi- cate clearly by adhering to language conventions appropriate to writing.	Concept 3		5%	
PROPORTION OF TOTAL MARK				50%	50%

*Many reading concepts presented in the English 30 Statement of Content are reflected in the reporting category headed THOUGHT AND DETAIL. Since writing assignments are generated from literary selections, the student has the opportunity, while writing Part A: Written Response, to construct his own response to a reading passage and to deal with concepts also tested in Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice).

**Program of Studies for Senior High Schools, p. 152(vi)-152(xi), and Senior High School Language Arts 1982 Curriculum Guide, pp. 21-31

Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)

Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice) consisted of 80 questions based on 10 reading selections. Information about the numbers and types of reading selections in Part B is presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Distribution of Reading Passage Types

Reading Passage Type	Number of Passages	Number of Questions
Modern Drama	1	8
Fiction	2	18
Non-fiction	3	22
Poetry	3	21
Shakespearean Drama	1	11
Total	10	80

Students were allotted two hours to write Part B. They were not allowed to use a dictionary or a thesaurus.

Reporting Categories for Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)

Questions were grouped into three reporting categories or subtests: Meanings (37 questions), Critical Response (17 questions), and Human Experience and Values (26 questions). Each reporting category required a minimum of six questions to achieve statistical reliability. The reporting categories used in Part B and the proportion of the total examination mark assigned to each reporting category or subtest is given in Table 3, page 7.

Cognitive Levels for Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)

A further design consideration affecting the development of Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice) was cognitive level. Items were classified according to three cognitive levels: Literal Understanding (13 questions), Inference and Application (51 questions), and Evaluation (16 questions). By considering cognitive level when developing an examination, the Student Evaluation Branch attempts to ensure that a variety of mental activities will be used by students as they write the examination. Questions listed under Literal Understanding are expected to be answered using skills of recognition and recall; those listed under Inference and Application are expected to elicit skills of analysis, interpretation, and application; and questions listed under Evaluation are designed to draw forth judgmental skills.

The classification of the questions for each reporting category for each cognitive level is shown in Table 3. In addition, the proportion of the total examination mark assigned to each cognitive level is given.

Table 3
English 30 Diploma Examination Blueprint
Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)

REPORTING CATEGORY	CROSS-REFERENCE TO ENGLISH 30 STATEMENT OF CONTENT**	COGNITIVE LEVEL			PROPORTION OF TOTAL MARK***
		LITERAL UNDERSTANDING	INFERENCE AND APPLICATION	EVALUATION	
1. MEANINGS The student should be able to understand, interpret, and evaluate author's purpose, theme, thesis, literal and figurative statements, and supporting details as presented in literary and non-literary materials.*	Concepts 6, 7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 19	19, 28, 33, 35, 37, 63, 64, 65, 68, 70 (10 questions)	4, 6, 9, 21, 27, 36, 40, 42, 44, 50, 52, 56, 57, 60, 62, 66, 69, 72, 73, 80 (20 questions)	1, 2, 3, 41, 49, 67, 71 (7 questions)	23% (37 questions)
2. CRITICAL RESPONSE The student should be able to understand, interpret, and evaluate literary and non-literary form, structure, and style as well as the relationships between form and content.	Concepts 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 20	59 (1 questions)	5, 8, 12, 16, 23, 38, 39, 43, 45, 51, 54, 55, 58, 61 (14 questions)	76, 78 (2 questions)	11% (17 questions)
3. HUMAN EXPERIENCE AND VALUES The student should be able to understand and interpret values expressed through literature. He should understand and interpret personalities and motives of characters, and the effects of the setting on character, mood, tone, and action.	Concepts 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15	30, 31 (2 questions)	7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 26, 32, 46, 48, 74, 77, 79 (17 questions)	20, 22, 29, 34, 47, 53, 75 (7 questions)	16% (26 questions)
PROPORTION OF TOTAL MARK***		8% (13 questions)	32% (51 questions)	10% (16 questions)	50% (80 questions)

* The examination presents a variety of selections from fiction, non-fiction (literary and functional), poetry, and Shakespearean and modern drama.

** Program of Studies for Senior High Schools, p. 152(11)-152(111), and Senior High School Language Arts 1982 Curriculum Guide, pp. 13-16

*** Part A: Written Response and Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice) each contributed 50% to the total examination mark.

CHAPTER 3

ADMINISTRATION OF THE EXAMINATION

In May 1984, the Student Records and Computer Services Branch of Alberta Education received the registration checklists from principals of all high schools in Alberta with students registered in Grade 12. Principals were asked to verify the registration of students in diploma examination courses within their schools and to indicate any changes in registration that might have occurred. These verified lists allowed Alberta Education, through the Student Evaluation Branch, to estimate numbers of examinations required for each diploma examination course for each school, and to prepare answer sheets and scoring sheets with specific student and school identification information.

Also in May 1984, each superintendent and high school principal was sent a copy of the document *Guidelines and Procedures for Administering the Grade 12 Diploma Examinations: June 1984 Administration*. This document included an explanation of the duties and responsibilities of the various parties involved in administering the examinations (the school jurisdiction, the school principal or Chief Presiding Examiner, and the teacher or Presiding Examiner.) In addition, information about security of the examinations, confidentiality of students' answers, exceptional cases, and examination rules was included.

After the examinations had been printed, they were placed in school packages by subject according to the registration checklist that had been verified by the principal. Each school was sent an extra number of examinations -- approximately 10% more than the list indicated.* This provided for changes in registration and for mature students.

A package of the diploma examinations was also prepared for each Chief Presiding Examiner (high school principal). In addition, information kits for the Chief Presiding Examiners (one per school) and the Presiding Examiners (approximately one for every 30 students in the school) were prepared. These information kits contained specific instructions necessary to ensure reliable administration of the examinations. All of this material was sent to the central office of each school jurisdiction in Alberta in early June 1984 for dissemination to schools.

*All high schools with students registered in Grade 12 received a minimum of three extra copies of each diploma examination to be kept on file in the school as information for teachers and students.

School jurisdictions were responsible for delivering examination materials to schools before the administration dates. School jurisdictions were also responsible for keeping the examinations secure prior to administration and for supervising the collection of examination materials from schools after administration.*

Examinations were returned to Alberta Education in the following manner: School jurisdictions in zones 1, 4, 5, and 6 returned materials as directed by their Regional Offices of Education; jurisdictions in zones 2 and 3 returned materials directly to the Student Evaluation Branch receiving area at the Legislature Annex, 9718 - 107 Street, Edmonton. At the Legislature Annex, the examinations from each school were checked against the school's List of Candidates and prepared for marking.

*Grade 12 diploma examinations written by students enrolled in category 1 private schools were administered by Regional Office of Education personnel.

CHAPTER 4

SCORING OF PART A: WRITTEN RESPONSE

Organization of Markers

A marking centre was established in Edmonton at the Legislature Annex. One hundred and sixty-three teachers from across the province of Alberta spent approximately one and one-half weeks (July 4 to July 14, 1984) marking Part A: Written Response. To qualify as a marker, each teacher was required to be currently teaching English 30, to have a valid permanent Alberta teaching certificate, and to have taught English 30 for at least two years.

The 163 markers were divided into 28 groups to facilitate the administration of scoring. Each group was headed by a group leader, who was responsible for helping to train the group of markers and to conduct reliability reviews. The group leaders met at the marking centre for an initial meeting with Student Evaluation Branch personnel on Tuesday, July 3 to review to the scoring guides that had been prepared (see pp. 27-30) and to read, discuss, and reach consensus about the quality of papers selected for training purposes.

Training

On Wednesday, July 4 the 163 markers met at the Legislature Annex. The first morning was used for training the markers. The training began with the markers being divided into four large groups. Student Evaluation Branch personnel led each of the groups through an overview of the marker's manual, a copy of which had been provided for each of the markers. The criterion-referenced scoring scales for each of the three writing assignments were presented to the markers. Markers then met in their small groups to read and discuss papers that had been selected for training purposes. Group leaders conducted these discussions.

Marking

The remainder of the scoring time was used for independent evaluation of student papers. Additional scoring sessions were held on a voluntary basis on six evenings and on Saturday, July 7.

Before papers were made available to the markers, student identification information was removed, and papers were randomly sorted into bundles of six. The bundles were grouped into nine large batches of approximately 1300 papers each. The scoring and processing of the papers in each batch was completed before a new batch was started. The purpose of the batch system is to allow for papers receiving discrepant scores to be identified, located, processed and rescored during the scoring session.

Even though all student and school identification information had been removed from each paper, markers were instructed to refer to their group leader any paper that they suspected was written by one of their own students.

All papers were scored independently three times. Markers took a bundle of papers from a table labelled "Unmarked Papers" and checked the back cover of each paper in the bundle to make certain they had not yet scored any of the papers. (Each marker had been assigned a number that was entered on the back of each of the papers as scored.) Markers returned to their groups and independently marked each of the papers in the bundle by applying the criterion-referenced scales. Markers assigned a score of 0 (insufficient) to 5 (exceptional) on each of the scales appropriate to the assignments. Markers entered the information on a machine-scorable sheet (see Appendix B, page 31), wrote their own marker number on the back cover of each paper, and returned the bundle of papers to another table labelled "Marked Papers." They then repeated this process.

Reliability Reviews

Reliability of results was of prime concern during the marking sessions. Because of this, reliability review sessions were scheduled twice daily -- at 10:00 a.m. and at 2:30 p.m. During the morning sessions, markers remained with their "home" groups. For the afternoon sessions group membership was rearranged. At these sessions, all markers were given identical papers. All markers independently read and evaluated the paper, and the group leaders recorded their initial scores. Each group then discussed the paper scale by scale, with the discrepant or divergent markers on a particular scale speaking first. Group members were given the opportunity to alter their scores. At the end of the reliability review, group leaders recorded the post-discussion scores and forwarded their record sheets to Student Evaluation Branch personnel, who then tallied and posted the distribution of pre and post discussion scores for that session. This information provided useful feedback for monitoring the application of the scoring guides by the markers.

As a further check on reliability, markers were given individual performance reports (see Appendix C, page 33). These performance reports gave information on numbers of papers scored by an individual and the percentage of these papers requiring rescoring because of discrepancy. The reports also informed individual markers of the percentage of scores on each of the scale points (0 to 5) they were assigning for each scale. In addition, markers were shown the frequency and direction of each discrepancy on each scale. Using the performance reports, each marker could compare his own performance with that of the group of 163 markers as a whole.

Scale-by-Scale Assignment of Final Mark

Once the papers from a batch had received three readings, their scoring sheets (see Appendix B, page 31) were scanned by computer. The computer was programmed to assign the median score for each scale as the final score. If, for example, the first marker had awarded a particular paper a 3 for Thought and Detail on Minor Assignment I (Critical Response), the second marker a 2, and the third a 4, the computer would have assigned that paper the median score of 3 for that particular scale. In this case, the scores given by the second and third markers (2 and 4) would have been considered divergent, since they each differed from the median score by one scale point. If, on the other hand, the first marker had awarded a 4, the second a 4, and the third a 2, the computer would have assigned the median score of 4 for the scale. In this second case, the scores given by the first two markers would have been in agreement (both 4's), but the score given by the third marker (2) would have been considered discrepant, since it differed from the median score by more than one scale point.

Handling of Discrepant Papers

Discrepancy on one scale alone was not enough to require a fourth reading for any paper. If, however, a number of scales on a particular paper were discrepantly scored by the first three markers, that paper was considered to be discrepant and was given a fourth reading. Scores assigned during the fourth reading had to fall within the range of scores that had been established by the first three markers. If, for example, the first marker had awarded the paper a 1 on a particular scale, the second marker a 3, and the third marker a 3, the fourth marker could award the paper a 1, a 2, or a 3 on this same scale. The fourth marker could not go outside the set range of scores to assign the paper a 0, a 4, or a 5 on that scale.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS

Total Examination Results

The results of the English 30 Diploma Examination are summarized in Table 4. The average mark for all students for the total examination was 62.3%. Students achieved an average of 30.9 marks out of 50 on Part A: Written Response, and an average of 31.4 marks out of 50 on Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice).

Table 4

Total Examination Results

	Mean	Standard Deviation*
Total Examination	62.3%	11.6
Part A: Written Response	30.9/50	6.7
Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)	31.4/50	6.4

N = 12 186

Standard test statistics indicate that the multiple-choice section has a satisfactory level of reliability for a test measuring a broad range of concepts and skills. The KR-20** coefficient for the multiple-choice part of the examination was 0.849.

*Standard Deviation is a measure of the variation in the distribution of scores. In a normal distribution, 68% of the scores will fall within one standard deviation of the mean.

**The KR-20 coefficient is a measure of internal consistency ranging from 0 to 1.

Standard-Setting

Every effort was made to design an English 30 diploma examination that would be a valid and reliable measure of what students can be expected to know as a result of instruction in this course. A specific standard or level of expectation inherent in the examination was established through careful test development procedures.

To ensure that each form of the examination administered in 1984 would be parallel, the Student Evaluation Branch adopted a process of standard-setting that involved classroom teachers in making judgments about the difficulty of the examination.

Twenty-eight of the markers, representing the various zones of the province, reviewed the difficulty level of each question in terms of a borderline passing student (who merits 50%). After these teachers gave their initial judgments on question difficulty, they were given information about the actual distribution of the students' examination marks. They were then given the opportunity to modify their judgments. Following a more general procedure, the standard-setters decided upon suggested achievement levels for borderline B and borderline A students (who merit 65% and 80% respectively). Although they suggested that a slightly larger number of students should receive A's, it was decided to accept the actual distribution as the standard because the teachers' recommendations and the actual distribution were very close.

Relationship Between School-Awarded Marks and Examination Marks

The averages for school-awarded marks, examination marks, and final blended marks were 63.8, 62.3, and 63.5 respectively. The percentages of students receiving A's, B's, C's, and F's is shown below in Table 5.

Table 5
Percentage Distribution of A's, B's, C's, and F's

Letter Grade	School-Awarded Mark	Examination Mark	Final Blended Mark*
A (80-100%)	10.8	6.9	6.9
B (65-79%)	37.5	35.8	38.4
C (50-64%)	41.5	45.1	49.0
F (0-49%)	8.9	12.2	5.8

*These final blended marks include the marks of students who did not receive BOTH a school-awarded mark and an examination mark for various reasons (see pages 1 and 2). Also, there are fewer F's in this distribution because of regression toward the mean. (For example, the students who received F as a school-awarded mark were not necessarily the same students who received F as an examination mark.)

The correlation between examination marks and school-awarded marks was 0.595, indicating that a moderate relationship exists between school-awarded marks and examination marks. It is reasonable, however, to expect differences between these two marks at the individual student level because the examination score is limited to reflecting achievement only in those objectives in English 30 that can be examined by a paper-and-pencil test, while the school-awarded mark reflects achievement in listening, speaking, viewing, and all other objectives of the course. The school-awarded mark also reflects the quality of work completed by the student.

Results for Part A: Written Response

The results for Part A: Written Response are given in tables 6, 7, and 8. The three tables present, in turn, the results for the three different assignments of Part A.

Minor Assignment I (Critical Response)

Table 6

Percentage Distribution of Scores on Critical Response

Score (Scale Points)	Reporting Category	
	Thought and Detail	Writing Skills
5 (Exceptional)	3.2	3.5
4 (Proficient)	25.6	37.8
3 (Satisfactory)	50.4	50.6
2 (Limited)	18.8	6.5
1 (Poor)	1.3	0.8
0 (Insufficient or No Response)	0.8	0.8

N = 12 186

Observations regarding the results for Minor Assignment I (Critical Response) follow: for Thought and Detail, 79.2% of the students scored Satisfactory or better (received scores of 3, 4, or 5), and 20.1% of the students scored Limited or Poor (received scores of 2 or 1). For Writing Skills, 91.9% of the students scored Satisfactory or better, and 7.3% scored Limited or Poor. A total of 0.8% of the students did not attempt Minor Assignment I (Critical Response), or produced compositions that were considered to be insufficient for marking purposes or were off-topic.

Minor Assignment II (Personal Response)

Table 7

Percentage Distribution of Scores on Personal Response

Score (Scale Points)	Reporting Category	
	Thought and Detail	Writing Skills
5 (Exceptional)	3.2	3.4
4 (Proficient)	23.1	31.3
3 (Satisfactory)	53.3	53.9
2 (Limited)	15.9	8.2
1 (Poor)	2.5	1.3
0 (Insufficient)	2.0	2.0

N = 12 186

Observations regarding the results for Minor Assignment II (Personal Response) follow: for Thought and Detail, 79.6% of the students scored Satisfactory or better (received scores of 3, 4, or 5), and 18.4% of the students scored Limited or Poor (received scores of 2 or 1). For Writing Skills, 88.6% of the students scored Satisfactory or better, and 9.5% scored Limited or Poor. Two per cent of the students did not attempt Minor Assignment II (Personal Response), or produced compositions that were considered to be insufficient for marking purposes or were off-topic.

Major Assignment

Table 8
Percentage Distribution of Scores on Major Assignment

Score	Reporting Category				
	Total Impression	Thought and Detail	Organization	Matters of Choice	Matters of Convention
5 (Exceptional)	2.9	3.1	3.1	4.1	6.0
4 (Proficient)	21.0	20.0	22.7	26.0	35.8
3 (Satisfactory)	53.9	47.0	55.4	55.4	45.6
2 (Limited)	19.9	26.6	17.0	12.3	10.1
1 (Poor)	1.7	2.5	1.0	1.4	1.7
0 (Insufficient)	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8

N = 12 186

Observations about the results for the Major Assignment follow: for Total Impression, 77.8% of the students scored Satisfactory or better (received scores of 3, 4, or 5), and 21.6% scored Limited or Poor (received scores of 2 or 1). For Thought and Detail, 70.1% of the students scored Satisfactory or better, and 29.1% scored Limited or Poor. For Organization, 81.2% of the students scored Satisfactory or better, and 18.0% scored Limited or Poor. For Matters of Choice, 85.5% of the students scored Satisfactory or better, and 13.7% scored Limited or Poor. For Matters of Convention, 87.4% of the students scored Satisfactory or better, and 11.8% scored Limited or Poor. A total of 0.8% of the students did not attempt the Major Assignment, or produced compositions that were considered to be insufficient for marking purposes or off-topic.

Results for Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)

The results for Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice) by reporting category are presented in Table 9. It is important to note that one question (#21) from the first reporting category, Meanings, was deleted from Part B. This meant that the 50% of the total mark for the English 30 Diploma Examination assigned to Part B was calculated from a possible raw score of 79. Discussion of question 21 and of other selected questions follows later in this report.

Table 9
Results for Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)
(Raw Scores)

Reporting Category	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. Meanings (36 questions)	22.6	4.8
2. Critical Response (17 questions)	9.8	2.7
3. Human Experience and Values (26 questions)	17.3	4.0

N = 12 186

For Meanings, all students scored an average of 22.6 questions correct out of a possible total of 36. For Critical Response all students scored 9.8 questions correct out of a possible total of 17. For Human Experience and Values all students scored 17.3 questions correct out of a possible total of 26.

Although performance in the different reporting categories appears to show some variation, caution is advised in comparing them. The sets of questions that make up each reporting category were not selected to be equal in average level of difficulty, therefore differences may be due to variations in question difficulty rather than in student performance. In combination with jurisdiction results, however, the means for each reporting category can be used to detect patterns of relative strength or weakness in achievement in each of the reporting categories.

Question response frequencies for all 80 questions appearing in Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice) are presented in Table 10.

Table 10
Question Response Frequencies

Question Number	Key	Percentage of All Students Choosing Alternative				Question Number	Key	Percentage of All Students Choosing Alternative			
		A	B	C	D			A	B	C	D
1	D	13	6	6	75	41	A	32	33	23	12
2	D	13	3	30	54	42	D	39	4	31	26
3	A	48	4	33	16	43	B	5	32	25	38
4	A	80	2	4	15	44	B	50	33	8	9
5	A	44	41	7	8	45	D	17	3	8	73
6	B	3	90	3	4	46	C	9	24	26	42
7	D	15	13	6	67	47	D	4	14	8	74
8	D	15	22	16	48	48	C	2	3	86	9
9	C	7	13	74	5	49	D	17	11	10	62
10	A	74	16	5	5	50	D	8	6	9	77
11	B	25	59	8	8	51	D	3	5	14	78
12	C	8	17	67	8	52	C	12	7	75	5
13	B	26	54	17	3	53	C	1	31	64	3
14	C	34	5	43	19	54	B	14	45	29	12
15	C	30	22	42	6	55	D	9	18	15	57
16	C	17	3	48	32	56	B	20	37	30	12
17	D	4	5	4	87	57	A	57	9	5	29
18	B	2	69	6	23	58	B	9	65	17	9
19	B	20	68	4	8	59	C	29	4	58	9
20	A	90	5	3	1	60	C	9	13	69	10
21*	A	39	11	31	18	61	C	26	31	30	13
22	B	2	69	26	3	62	B	16	50	24	10
23	B	5	72	10	13	63	C	3	29	66	2
24	D	20	37	1	42	64	C	11	20	61	8
25	A	60	14	20	7	65	B	10	76	9	5
26	D	4	2	1	93	66	D	12	17	13	58
27	D	3	38	14	45	67	D	4	40	7	49
28	A	88	3	7	2	68	B	13	68	8	11
29	B	3	68	4	25	69	A	54	6	18	23
30	B	7	74	12	8	70	A	70	7	6	17
31	C	1	3	92	4	71	C	3	12	65	20
32	D	5	13	7	75	72	D	6	10	2	81
33	A	69	7	15	8	73	C	6	2	83	8
34	A	56	8	26	10	74	A	55	7	12	25
35	B	27	54	6	12	75	C	5	7	76	11
36	C	2	1	94	2	76	B	10	75	7	8
37	D	8	11	34	47	77	C	8	5	61	26
38	B	5	83	6	7	78	B	39	34	4	23
39	D	4	13	17	66	79	A	71	4	12	12
40	D	15	4	13	68	80	D	3	24	12	60

N = 12 186

*Question 21 was deleted from the examination. This means that the 50% of the total examination mark assigned to Part B was calculated out of a possible raw score of 79. The question response frequencies given here for question 21 are based on a preliminary sample of 2884. Numbers may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Discussion of Selected Questions

Question 21 was deleted from the exam. It appeared with the short story "Eveline," by James Joyce.

21. That Eveline sits with Frank in an "unaccustomed" place in the theatre (line 72) shows that Eveline's life has been

- A. characterized by routine
- B. devoid of entertainment
- C. restricted by poverty
- D. untouched by glamor

A preliminary analysis revealed that while 39% of the students chose A, the intended correct answer, 31% chose C. Questions 16, 17, 19, and 20 establish the awareness that although Eveline's life is harsh and bleak, it is also predictable and secure. Question 21 was intended to reinforce the understanding that even in the matter of entertainment, Eveline would make routine choices. The word "unaccustomed" in the stem was used to draw the student's attention to the routine mentioned in alternative A. However, many students apparently felt that Eveline's harsh life would either not allow for theatre or would restrict her to the "cheap seats." Since the story provided justification for both choices, the question was deleted.

Question 37 was reviewed because it proved to be difficult. Only 47% of the students chose the correct alternative (D). This item appeared with an excerpt from *Much Ado About Nothing*, by William Shakespeare.

37. Benedick explains his change of mind about marriage by saying that formerly he had

- A. neglected his duty to continue the family name
- B. never met a woman who met his exacting standards
- C. made foolish decisions because of his youthfulness
- D. thought that he would probably die at an early age

Thirty-four per cent of the students chose alternative C. Although the excerpt implies that Benedick was foolish, Benedick himself merely says that he has changed his tastes, not that his former inclinations were foolish. Alternative D required only a literal understanding of Benedick's words, "when I said I would die a bachelor, I did not think I should live till I were married" (lines 15-16). This question was retained because it has a correct answer justifiable from the text.

Questions 42 and 43 appeared with the poem "Naming of Parts," by Henry Reed.

42. The poet's attitude toward the activity of naming parts is

- A. enthusiastic
- B. sympathetic
- C. apathetic
- D. critical

43. In the fourth line of each of the first four stanzas, there is a shift in focus from
- A. the present to the future
 - B. what is happening to what is felt
 - C. what is specific to what is general
 - D. the practical to the insignificant

Both questions proved very difficult, with only 26% of the students answering question 42 correctly (D) and only 32% answering 43 correctly (B). Both questions require an awareness of the tone of the poem, and an understanding of the narrative point of view in the poem -- i.e. who is speaking, and what is the speaker's relationship to the poet. The fact that a relatively high number of students chose 42A (39%) and 42C (31%) suggests that they may not have been aware of the changes in language and rhythm. Perhaps the repetition of the words "naming of parts," especially in the first stanza, represented "enthusiasm" to some students. The choice of 42C by 31% of the students may be explained if students were confusing the speaker's shift from literal task to imaginative reflection as apathy rather than a deliberate criticism of the task. This confusion would explain the relatively high number of students who chose 43D (38%). Although in the poem there is a shift away from the practical lesson, the description of spring is significant; it is deliberate juxtaposition by the poet. Both 42 and 43 were retained because they present a reasonable expectation of Grade 12 students: determining a writer's purpose, and apprehending meaning and tone.

Question 46 appeared with an excerpt from *Becket*, by Jean Anouilh.

46. The italicized directions for the speakers suggest that
- A. Becket is happy while the King is cold-hearted
 - B. the King is impulsive which Becket is cautious
 - C. the King is impassioned while Becket is restrained
 - D. Becket is affectionate while the King is frustrated

Only 26% of the students chose C, the correct answer. However, the question discriminated well between high achievers and low achievers on the exam, with 42% of the high achievers choosing the correct answer and only 16% of the low achievers choosing the correct answer. Alternative D attracted 42% of the students. These students may have been considering the words of the two characters, rather than the italicized directions, or they may not have read all of the italicized directions. It is valid to expect students to consider carefully the directions in a dramatic work. Therefore the question was retained.

Question 61 appeared with the essay "On Right and Wrong," by K. C. Cole.

61. To introduce the focus of her essay the writer uses
- A. a hypothetical situation
 - B. a rhetorical question
 - C. an anecdote
 - D. an analogy

Although this question was answered correctly (C) by only 30% of the students, it discriminated well between high achievers and low achievers on the total exam. Fifty-five per cent of the high achievers chose C as the right answer, while only 15% of the low achievers chose C. The question requires that students be able to differentiate among four literary terms and has high curricular validity.

Question 67 also appeared with the essay "On Right and Wrong."

67. The writer's MAIN idea is that

- A. old theories are disregarded when new discoveries are made
- B. right and wrong are used differently in science than in daily life
- C. scientists are concerned with determining absolute right and wrong
- D. new dimensions are added to older ideas as scientific knowledge grows

In evaluation questions such as this one, students are required to choose the best answer from among four possible right answers. The essay presented a challenging reading experience demanding some careful rereading. Students who did not take the time to read carefully were attracted to alternative B (40%). The words "right and wrong" in the alternative proved to be strong distractors. The writer does say that scientists use these words in unconventional ways, but her thesis is considerably more specific. That which we might call wrong, she says, a true scientist would call merely limited. Although only 49% of the students answered this question correctly (D), it represents a fair test of reading skills.

Question 78 is also an evaluation question. It appeared with an excerpt from "Revenge," by Ellen Gilchrist.

78. The detail that BEST foreshadows Rhoda's success as a pole-vaulter is

- A. her refusal to admit defeat
- B. the ease with which she scaled the fence
- C. the fact that she began sweating heavily
- D. her knowledge of exactly what to do first

The test results seem to indicate some confusion about the term "foreshadowing." The question asks for a detail of the plot to be identified. Thirty-nine per cent of the students chose A as the answer, while 34% chose the correct answer B. Alternatives A and D describe qualities of character, rather than details of plot. In lines 27 and 28, Rhoda gets over the fence using a movement similar to that required in pole-vaulting. She "[climbs] the fence in one motion, dropping lightly down on the other side." At this point, the careful reader receives the distinct impression that Rhoda will vault successfully once she learns the technique. Here again, students are required to consider each alternative carefully before deciding which is BEST.

Summary of Observations

Total Examination

Achievement on the English 30 Diploma Examination was generally regarded as acceptable by teachers involved in the examination development and marking processes. The examination mean was 62.3%. The fact that only 12.2% of the students writing the examination scored less than 50% suggests that students are successfully learning those concepts and skills covered by the English 30 Diploma Examination. It should be noted, however, that there were relatively few high achievers on this particular examination. Only 6.9% of the students scored 80% or better.

Part A: Written Response

Overall achievement on Part A: Written Response was fairly good. On Minor Assignment I (Critical Response), the majority of students (79.2% to 91.9%) scored Satisfactory or better depending upon the reporting category being examined. On Minor Assignment II (Personal Response), the majority of students (79.6% to 88.6%) again scored Satisfactory or better depending upon the reporting category being examined.

On the Major Assignment, student performance was poorer than on the minor assignments. To do well, students had to have a good understanding of the literature they chose to discuss. On Total Impression, 77.8% of the students scored Satisfactory or better. The category in which students scored lowest was Thought and Detail -- 70.1% scored Satisfactory or better. Achievement in the remaining categories of Organization, Matters of Choice, and Matters of Convention was quite acceptable, with 81.2% to 87.4% of students scoring Satisfactory or better.

Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice)

Achievement on Part B: Reading (Multiple Choice) was adequate. The overall mean on Part B was 49.4 raw score marks out of 79. This indicates an acceptable standard of achievement.

Scoring Guide: Minor Assignments

Thought and Detail (Curriculum Concepts 1 and 3 to 13 inclusive)

5. EXCEPTIONAL writing presents mature and insightful ideas enriched by effective and significant details. Literary interpretations, where required, are perceptive and defensible. The choice of details from the selections contributes significantly to the development of ideas.
4. PROFICIENT writing presents insightful ideas supported by appropriate details OR conventional ideas supported by effective and significant details. Literary interpretations, where required, are perceptive and defensible. The choice of details from the selections contributes to the development of ideas.
3. SATISFACTORY writing presents conventional ideas supported by appropriate details. Literary interpretations, where required, are defensible. The choice of details from the selections supports the ideas.
2. LIMITED writing presents conventional ideas that are either unsupported or are accompanied by inappropriate details. Literary interpretations, where required, are incomplete or superficial. The choice of details from the selections does not support the ideas coherently.
1. POOR writing presents scant ideas and details that do not develop the topic. Literary interpretations, where required, are not defensible. The choice of details from the selections obscures the ideas.
0. INSUFFICIENT writing shows no discernible attempt to fulfil the assignment, OR is so deficient in length that it is not possible to assess thought and detail.

Writing Skills (Curriculum Concepts 2, 3, 4, 5)

5. EXCEPTIONAL writing communicates cogently through accurate and effective diction and sentence structure. Effective use of convention enhances the communicative power of the composition.
4. PROFICIENT writing communicates capably through accurate and generally effective diction and sentence structure. Errors of spelling, punctuation, and grammar do not reduce the communicative power of the composition.
3. SATISFACTORY writing communicates clearly through generally accurate and generally effective diction and sentence structure. Errors of spelling, punctuation, and grammar reduce but seldom impede the communicative power of the composition.
2. LIMITED writing communicates incompletely through generally accurate but frequently ineffective diction and sentence structure. Errors of spelling, punctuation, and grammar often impede the communicative power of the composition.
1. POOR writing communicates unsuccessfully through frequently inaccurate and generally ineffective diction and sentence structure. Errors of spelling, punctuation, and grammar severely impede the communicative power of the composition.
0. INSUFFICIENT writing is writing that has been awarded a zero for Thought and Detail.

Scoring Guide Major Assignment

Total Impression (Curriculum Concepts 1 to 13 inclusive)

5. EXCEPTIONAL writing presents perceptive ideas, supporting details, words, and structures that form a coherent and unified whole. The writer's purpose and intended audience are unquestionably evident throughout the work, and his tone is both apparent and always appropriate. This writing communicates clearly, effectively, and with vitality. Such writing demands respect.
4. PROFICIENT writing presents appropriate ideas, supporting details, words, and structures that form a coherent and unified whole. The writer's purpose and intended audience are clear throughout the work, and his tone is generally apparent and appropriate. This writing communicates clearly and effectively. Such writing prompts attention.
3. SATISFACTORY writing presents conventional ideas, supporting details, words, and structures that form a coherent and unified whole. The writer's purpose and intended audience are generally clear throughout the work, and his tone, when apparent, is appropriate. This writing communicates clearly. Such writing is usually accepted as adequate.
2. LIMITED writing presents casual ideas, supporting details, words, and structures that lack coherence and unity. The writer's purpose, intended audience, and tone are generally unclear. This writing communicates ineffectively or incompletely. Such writing does not satisfy the reader.
1. POOR writing lacks a central idea, purpose, or focus. Coherence and unity are not achieved. The writer's purpose and intended audience are unclear. The tone is either inappropriate or unclear. This writing impedes communication. Such writing frustrates the reader.
0. INSUFFICIENT writing is writing that has been awarded a zero for Thought and Detail.

Thought and Detail (Curriculum Concepts 1 and 3 to 13 inclusive)

5. EXCEPTIONAL writing presents mature and insightful ideas enriched by effective and significant details. Literary interpretations are perceptive and defensible. The selection of literature to be discussed is appropriate for the topic and the level of discussion. The choice of details from literature contributes significantly to the development of ideas.
4. PROFICIENT writing presents insightful ideas supported by appropriate details, OR conventional ideas supported by effective details. Literary interpretations are perceptive and defensible. The selection of literature to be discussed is appropriate for the topic and the level of discussion. The choice of details from literature contributes significantly to the development of ideas.

Thought and Detail (continued)

3. SATISFACTORY writing presents conventional ideas supported by appropriate details. Literary interpretations are defensible. The selection of literature to be discussed is appropriate for the topic and the level of discussion. The choice of details from literature supports the ideas.
2. LIMITED writing presents conventional ideas that are either unsupported or are accompanied by inappropriate details. Literary interpretations are incomplete or superficial. The selection of literature to be discussed is questionable and does not supply significant supporting details. The choice of details from literature does not support the ideas coherently.
1. POOR writing presents scant ideas and details that do not develop the topic. Literary interpretations are not defensible. The selection of literature to be discussed is inappropriate. The choice of details from literature obscures the ideas.
0. INSUFFICIENT writing shows no discernible attempt to fulfil the assignment, OR makes no references to literature in the discussion, OR makes literary references to only the material on the examination, OR is so deficient in length that it is not possible to assess thought and detail.

Organization (Curriculum Concepts 2, 3, 4, 5)

5. EXCEPTIONAL writing presents a compelling introduction, successfully constructed to provoke further reading. The middle is crafted so that the sentences and ideas flow smoothly to an effective conclusion.
4. PROFICIENT writing presents an effective introduction that attempts to encourage further reading. The middle is developed so that sentences and ideas flow smoothly to an appropriate conclusion.
3. SATISFACTORY writing presents a focused and functional introduction, middle, and conclusion. Sentences and ideas are clearly related but coherence occasionally falters.
2. LIMITED writing may lack an introduction, or have an introduction that is not functional. The conclusion, if attempted, may be unsuccessful. Relationships among sentences and relationships among ideas are frequently unclear.
1. POOR writing presents neither an introduction nor a conclusion. Sentences and ideas are presented in no particular order.
0. INSUFFICIENT writing is writing that has been awarded a zero for Thought and Detail.

Scoring Guide Major Assignment (continued)

Matters of Choice (Style) (Curriculum Concept 3)

5. EXCEPTIONAL writing presents a selection and use of words and sentence structures that is accurate, effective, and often polished. Choices appear to have been made deliberately to achieve a particular purpose. Tone is discernible, appropriate, and controlled.
4. PROFICIENT writing presents a selection and use of words and sentence structures that is accurate and generally effective. Choices frequently appear to have been made deliberately to achieve a particular purpose. Tone is discernible, appropriate, and usually controlled.
3. SATISFACTORY writing presents a selection and use of words and sentence structures that is generally accurate and generally effective. Choices occasionally appear to have been made deliberately to achieve a particular purpose. Tone, when discernible, is appropriate.
2. LIMITED writing presents a selection and use of words and sentence structures that is frequently inaccurate and ineffective. Choices seldom appear to have been made deliberately to achieve a particular purpose. Tone may be absent or inappropriate.
1. POOR writing presents a selection and use of words and structures that is frequently inaccurate, ineffective.
0. INSUFFICIENT writing is writing that has been awarded a zero for Thought and Detail.

Matters of Convention (Curriculum Concept 3)

5. EXCEPTIONAL writing is essentially free from errors of spelling, punctuation, and grammar. The effective use of conventions enhances the communicative power of the composition.
4. PROFICIENT writing is essentially free from errors of spelling, punctuation, and grammar. Errors that are present do not reduce the communicative power of the composition.
3. SATISFACTORY writing has occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, and grammar. These errors reduce but seldom impede the communicative power of the composition.
2. LIMITED writing has frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, and grammar. These errors often impede the communicative power of the composition.
1. POOR writing has errors of spelling, punctuation, and grammar that are both noticeable and jarring. These errors severely impede the communicative power of the composition.
0. INSUFFICIENT writing is writing that has been awarded a zero for Thought and Detail.

SCORING SHEET

READER'S
I.D. NUMBER

8
8
8

1

BLANK BOOKLET

READING #

1

ENGLISH 30
3100 60004

COURSE CODE INDEX NO.

COURSE CODE

INDEX NO.

3100
COURSE CODE3100
COURSE C

60004
INDEX NO

IDENTIFICATION

1. MINOR ASSIGNMENT:

NO RESPONSE

○
↑
3a

THOUGHT AND DETAIL

WRITING SKILLS

0	0
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5

3b

2. MINOR ASSIGNMENT:

NO RESPONSE

○
↑
4a

THOUGHT AND DETAIL

WRITING SKILLS

0	0
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5

4b

3. MAJOR ASSIGNMENT:

NO RESPONSE

5a

TOTAL IMPRESSION

THOUGHT AND DETAIL

ORGANIZATION

MATTERS OF CHOICE

MATTERS OF CONVENTION

0 1 2 3 4 5

0 1 2 3 4 5

0 1 2 3 4 5

0 1 2 3 4 5

0 1 2 3 4 5

5b

- English 30
Using the Scoring Sheet
USE HB PENCIL
1. Insert your reader number in figures, fill in the corresponding bubbles.
 2. If no questions have been answered, fill in this bubble.
 3. (a) If there is no response to Minor Assignment 1, fill in this bubble.
OR
(b) Score Minor Assignment 1 by filling in the appropriate bubble for each scale.
 4. (a) If there is no response to Minor Assignment 2, fill in this bubble.
OR
(b) Score Minor Assignment 2 by filling in the appropriate bubble for each scale.
 5. (a) If there is no response to the Major Assignment, fill in this bubble.
OR
(b) Score the Major assignment by filling in the appropriate bubble for each scale.
 6. Turn to the back cover of the test booklet and enter your Marker Number in the appropriate box.

[illegible]

DO NOT MARK HERE

DO NOT MARK HERE

070006

LB 3054 C2 0723 1984-JUNE C-2
PROVINCIAL REPORT GRADE 12
DIPLOMA EXAMINATION ENGLISH
30 --
SERIAL M1 39899816 EDUC



DATE DUE SLIP

EDUC APR 30 '93

1992 DEC 07 RETURN

F255

PERIODICAL

39899816 EDUC

INDIVIDUAL MARKER PERFORMANCE REPORT

INDIVIDUAL MARKER FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT - ENGLISH 30

DATE: 17/ 8/84

MARKER: 000

NUMBER OF PAPERS SCORED: 199 AVERAGE FOR ALL MARKERS: 209.

PERCENT OF PAPERS REQUIRING RESCORING: 5.0% AVERAGE FOR ALL MARKERS: 9.9%

THE FOLLOWING TABLES WILL ALLOW YOU TO COMPARE THE SCORES YOU HAVE GIVEN TO THE PAPERS YOU HAVE SCORED. THE AVERAGES FOR ALL MARKERS ON ALL PAPERS SCORED ON THE FIRST TABLE SHOWS THE FREQUENCY IN PERCENT OF WHICH YOU AWARDED SCORES IN EACH CATEGORY FOR EACH MARKING SCALE, AND THE PERCENTAGE OF ALL SCORES FROM ALL MARKERS FOR THE SAME CATEGORY.

SINCE A DIFFERENT SELECTION OF PAPERS WAS MARKED BY EACH MARKER, SOME VARIATION IS EXPECTED.

SCALE BY SCALE CATEGORY FREQUENCIES IN PERCENT

SCALE NAME	0	1	2	3	4	5
MINOR ASSIGNMENT 1 THOUGHT AND DETAIL WRITING SKILLS	0.8 0.5 0.5	2.6 6.9 0.5	21.4 10.7 6.0	43.7 40.7 41.7	25.1 32.0 42.7	6.4 6.0 5.5
MINOR ASSIGNMENT 2 THOUGHT AND DETAIL WRITING SKILLS	2.4 2.5 2.5	4.0 10.7 1.5	19.2 9.0 5.3	46.1 38.3 51.3	32.2 39.1 31.2	6.1 6.1 4.5
MAJOR ASSIGNMENT TOTAL IMPRESSION THOUGHT AND DETAIL ORGANIZATION	1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0	3.0 3.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0	21.9 20.7 17.5 18.0 15.0 10.9	47.3 52.3 47.3 60.8 48.9 44.2	30.9 32.0 22.1 18.1 35.4 33.7	5.4 5.3 5.0 5.9 6.9 3.5
MATTERS OF CHOICE MATTERS OF CONVENTION	1.0 1.0	2.0 1.0	10.9 12.7	48.9 48.2	35.4 33.7	7.0 3.5

For Minor Assignment 1: Thought and Detail scale, 2.6% of all marks awarded were 1's, 21.4% were 2's, and 43.7% were 3's.
Marker 000 gave fewer 1's (2.0%), more 2's (23.6%), and fewer 3's (40.7%).

THE SECOND TABLE INDICATES THE AMOUNT AND DIRECTION OF VARIATIONS FROM THE FINAL SCORE ASSIGNED TO A PAPER ON EACH SCALE. ON THIS TABLE, MARKERS ARE COMPARED TO OTHER MARKERS ON THE SCORES THEY ASSIGNED TO PAPERS MARKED IN COMMON. IF A MARKER HAS A SCORE BELOW THE FINAL SCORE, A NEGATIVE DISCREPANCY IS A SCORE BELOW THE FINAL SCORE.

SCALE BY SCALE FREQUENCIES OF MARKER VARIATION FROM FINAL SCORE IN PERCENT

SCALE NAME	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5
MINOR ASSIGNMENT 1 THOUGHT AND DETAIL WRITING SKILLS	0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0	1.5 0.7 0.0	14.5 17.6 9.0	67.5 66.5 72.1	14.8 10.1 13.1	1.6 4.0 1.8	0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0
MINOR ASSIGNMENT 2 THOUGHT AND DETAIL WRITING SKILLS	0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0	1.5 0.8 1.0	13.9 12.5 9.5	68.4 74.9 79.9	13.3 13.4 9.0	1.5 0.8 0.5	0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0
MAJOR ASSIGNMENT TOTAL IMPRESSION THOUGHT AND DETAIL ORGANIZATION	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1.5 1.0 1.0 1.0	14.6 15.9 14.4 12.6	68.4 64.3 66.3 77.0	12.2 16.8 14.3 13.9	1.5 1.0 1.0 1.0	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
MATTERS OF CHOICE MATTERS OF CONVENTION	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	1.0 1.2	16.1 16.1	71.4 71.4	10.6 10.6	1.0 1.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0

For Minor Assignment 1: Thought and Detail scale, all markers gave the median mark of the three awarded marks to each paper 67.5% of the time. They gave marks 1 below the median 14.5% of the time, and marks 1 above the median 14.8% of the time. Marker 000 was on the median 66.8% of the time, 1 below the median 17.6% of the time, and 1 above the median 10.1% of the time.

NOTE: ZERO SCORES INCLUDE BLANKS, NO RESPONSE, AND INSUFFICIENT RANKINGS.

B49333